§51.59

minority voters have been adversely affected by present or past discrimination

 $[52~{\rm FR}~490,~{\rm Jan.}~6,~1987,~{\rm as~amended~by~Order}~3262–2011,~76~{\rm FR}~21249,~{\rm Apr.}~15,~2011]$

§51.59 Redistricting plans.

- (a) Relevant factors. In determining whether a submitted redistricting plan has a prohibited purpose or effect the Attorney General, in addition to the factors described above, will consider the following factors (among others):
- (1) The extent to which malapportioned districts deny or abridge the right to vote of minority citizens:
- (2) The extent to which minority voting strength is reduced by the proposed redistricting:
- (3) The extent to which minority concentrations are fragmented among different districts;
- (4) The extent to which minorities are over concentrated in one or more districts;
- (5) The extent to which available alternative plans satisfying the jurisdiction's legitimate governmental interests were considered;
- (6) The extent to which the plan departs from objective redistricting criteria set by the submitting jurisdiction, ignores other relevant factors such as compactness and contiguity, or displays a configuration that inexplicably disregards available natural or artificial boundaries; and
- (7) The extent to which the plan is inconsistent with the jurisdiction's stated redistricting standards.
- (b) Discriminatory purpose. A jurisdiction's failure to adopt the maximum possible number of majority-minority districts may not be the sole basis for determining that a jurisdiction was motivated by a discriminatory purpose.

[Order 3262-2011, 76 FR 21249, Apr. 15, 2011]

§51.60 Changes in electoral systems.

In making determinations with respect to changes in electoral systems (e.g., changes to or from the use of atlarge elections, changes in the size of elected bodies) the Attorney General, in addition to the factors described above, will consider the following factors (among others):

- (a) The extent to which minority voting strength is reduced by the proposed change.
- (b) The extent to which minority concentrations are submerged into larger electoral units.
- (c) The extent to which available alternative systems satisfying the jurisdiction's legitimate governmental interests were considered.

§51.61 Annexations.

- Coverage. Annexations deannexations, even of uninhabited land, are subject to section 5 preclearance to the extent that they alter or are calculated to alter the composition of a jurisdiction's electorate. See, e.g., City of Pleasant Grove v. United States, 479 U.S. 462 (1987). In analyzing annexations deannexations under section 5, the Attorney General considers the purpose and effect of the annexations and deannexations only as they pertain to voting.
- (b) Section 5 review. It is the practice of the Attorney General to review all of a jurisdiction's unprecleared annexations and deannexations together. See City of Pleasant Grove v. United States, C.A. No. 80–2589 (D.D.C. Oct. 7, 1981).
- (c) Relevant factors. In making determinations with respect to annexations, the Attorney General, in addition to the factors described above, will consider the following factors (among others):
- (1) The extent to which a jurisdiction's annexations reflect the purpose or have the effect of excluding minorities while including other similarly situated persons.
- (2) The extent to which the annexations reduce a jurisdiction's minority population percentage, either at the time of the submission or, in view of the intended use, for the reasonably foreseeable future.
- (3) Whether the electoral system to be used in the jurisdiction fails fairly to reflect minority voting strength as it exists in the post-annexation jurisdiction. See *City of Richmond* v. *United States*, 422 U.S. 358, 367–72 (1975).

[52 FR 490, Jan. 6, 1987; 52 FR 2648, Jan. 23, 1987, as amended by Order 3262–2011, 76 FR 21249, Apr. 15, 2011]